

about this issue before the accident but now it has sparked a great interest within me. First, I am very much against embryonic stem cell research and advancement. I do not support this aspect at all. The killing of human life is appalling to me. But with adult stem cell and non-embryonic stem cell research I have become an advocate. My personal experience with adult stem cell transplantation should awaken the United States to the unlimited possibilities. This technique is simply "your body healing itself". Medical research in the United States has always been respected and admired for the advances toward cure for cancer, arthritis treatments and medication, heart disease and other well-known diseases and ailments. But when it comes to spinal cord injuries, the U.S. is very much in the negative category. We as taxpayers pay more money in the daily care of a spinal cord injury victim than we do on a cure. Now why is that???? The medical society treats the injury at the onset, then teaches the individual to live in a wheelchair and function accordingly. Then they are sent home and told, "You will never walk again". I experienced that first hand.

But I am walking again. I have goals of walking by the end of the year with my

braces and crutches. This was made possible by the procedure in Portugal and aggressive rehab. But I had to leave the comfort of my home and country and travel to a foreign area to get this done. Now that is sad, isn't it?

This tragedy that happened to me can happen to anyone. It could be your wife, husband, son, daughter or friend. What would you want for them? Simply a statement, "You'll never walk again" or "Never give up hope—there is a better option for you."

Wake up, United States!!!! We are missing out. Let's look at the issue in a more personal level—I can walk again.

Sincerely,

JACKI RABON,
Waverly, IL.

Jacki was up last week. She now has feeling in her hips. She is out of the wheelchair. She can walk with braces. She needs more of these treatments.

My point in saying this, why are we sending her to Portugal to do this procedure when this should be done in the United States and researched in the United States? She is probably going to need more of these treatments to get

the spinal cord to fully fuse. They take these cells out of the base of the nose, grow them, put them right in the spinal cord area where it has broken, and they start to knit the spinal cord back together. But it is probably not going to be just one treatment. It is probably going to be multiple treatments.

She had to do fundraising to raise \$50,000 to go overseas to do this. It was not covered by an insurance company. Why wouldn't we develop protocols here to get this done with adult stem cells instead of diverting research money into speculative areas like embryonic stem cells and human cloning? We should put funding into areas to help people like Jacki.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table on the level of funding we have done on embryonic and nonembryonic areas.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. FEDERAL TAXPAYER FUNDING—TOTAL NIH STEM CELL RESEARCH—FY 2002–FY 2006

(Dollars in millions)²

	FY 2002 Actual			FY 2003 Actual			FY 2004 Actual			FY 2005 Actual			Combined total		
	Non Embryonic	Embryonic	Total	Non Embryonic	Embryonic	Total	Non Embryonic	Embryonic	Total	Non Embryonic	Embryonic	Total	Non Embryonic	Embryonic	Total
Human Subtotal	170.9	10.1	181.0	190.7	20.3	211.0	203.2	24.3	227.5	199.4	39.6	239.0	764.2	94.3	858.5
Nonhuman, Subtotal	134.1	71.5	205.5	192.1	113.5	305.6	235.7	89.3	325.0	273.2	97.0	370.2	835.1	371.3	1,206.3
NIH, Total	305.0	81.6	386.6	382.9	133.8	516.6	439.0	113.6	552.5	472.5	136.7	609.2	1,599.4	465.7	2,064.9

¹ Decrease from FY03 to FY04 is the result of a change in methodology used to collect nonhuman embryonic funding figures. This methodology change also contributed to an increase in nonhuman non-embryonic.

² Numbers may not add due to rounding.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I thank the Chair for this time. I also note to my colleagues we are going to have, I hope, a full-scale debate on this in July, and I hope my colleagues would look at where the science is taking us. The moral questions I think are clear. To others they are not. This is illegal and immoral.

The bigger question in front of us now is, is embryonic fully unnecessary? Why would we proceed on this route?

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). The clerk will call the roll. The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, what is the order of business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business.

Mr. DURBIN. And the minority side has?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority side has 30 minutes.

EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I would like to follow up on the statement just recently made on the floor by my colleague and friend from the

State of Kansas, Senator BROWNBACK. I deeply respect his personal, strong, moral, and religious convictions when it comes to this issue. But I respectfully disagree with his conclusion.

In August of 2001, just a few weeks before the 9/11 attacks, President George W. Bush made an announcement which was virtually unprecedented. The President made the announcement that he was, by executive order, going to restrict medical research in America.

I can't recall that ever happening before. Perhaps there had been decisions made at lower levels that could parallel this, but this was unprecedented, that our leader, our President, would announce that as a matter of policy the Federal Government, the U.S. Government, would limit research, medical research.

Of course, his announcement on how he was going to do it left many people puzzled. It was all over the question of embryonic stem cell research. It is a complicated area that I don't profess any special expertise in speaking to. But my understanding is that when a husband and wife are unable to conceive a child in the normal way, they turn to a process known as in vitro fertilization where they try to replicate in a laboratory what happens in normal human life. They bring together the egg from the woman, the sperm from the man, and join them into a life which is then implanted into the womb of the mother.

I think it is miraculous and a source of great happiness and joy for couples who otherwise would not have children.

There are some religions which believe that this whole process is immoral, that we should not allow anyone to engage in this kind of in vitro fertilization. I happen to believe from an ethical viewpoint that if a husband and wife in a loving relationship are so determined to have a child that they will go to this length and this extent and then God blesses them with a child, that is a good thing. That is my conclusion. That is how I come down on it. So I would not ban this process. I think this process is a positive thing, a positive family value.

But the process, much like the ordinary human process of conception and creation, is not one that is absolutely perfect. In the ordinary process of human conception not all of the combinations of this sperm and egg result in human life. Neither do they in the in vitro fertilization process. So at the end of the day when these couples are seeking to have a baby there is left over these potential lives in this little glass dish in a laboratory.

Our debate is about those potential lives. They will never become children. They never have a chance to become children or babies, obviously, unless they are implanted in a mother's womb.

That is the reality. What happens is that many of these couples, after spending extraordinary amounts of

money, end up freezing these leftover embryonic stem cells in case their effort is unsuccessful so they can try again.

When they are successful the question then arises, what happens to these embryonic stem cells? If there is no purpose for them, many of these couples say, Discard them; we don't need them anymore. And they are discarded and thrown away.

So the question which we face is whether or not those stem cells should be taken and used in medical research. Why would we want to? Because they are special. Because of the nature of these stem cells, they have the greatest potential to be helpful in curing diseases and in dealing with medical challenges that no other branch of research has been able to address.

This stem cell research was addressed by President George W. Bush in August of 2001. He came up with a morally curious position. He said that all of the stem cell lines that had been created to the date preceding his speech could be used for medical research, but no others in the future.

I don't follow the moral argument of how some stem cells can be used with immunity and from that date forward no others can be used. Sadly, the stem cell lines that he identified were very limited. Some had been contaminated. Their potential for medical research is extremely restricted. So the debate has moved from the President's decision to Capitol Hill.

The House of Representatives has passed legislation. If you would pick up the calendar of the Senate, you would find H.R. 810. H.R. 810 is a legislative measure that has passed the House of Representatives and has come to the Senate and has been sitting on this calendar for 1 year. In the course of that period of time, we have received the assurance of the Republican leader, BILL FRIST, a medical doctor, that he will support the passage of stem cell research. For 1 year we have been waiting, 1 year in which thousands of Americans suffering from diabetes, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's, Lou Gehrig's disease, spinal cord injuries have been waiting. They have been waiting to get on the political calendar of the United States Senate. I don't understand why we have not called up this bill for consideration.

Look at what we have done in the month of June. We have considered two constitutional amendments which have been defeated, neither of which are high priorities for Americans. Don't take my word for it. In a poll of Americans they said, pick out the most important things you think the Senate can work on, and out of 40 choices that people volunteered, No. 32 on the list was gay marriage—out of 40 choices—and the flag amendment didn't even make the list. We ate up the precious time of the Senate during the month of June on these measures which were defeated. Weeks went by when we could have considered stem cell research,

medical research that offers an opportunity for cures for people who are suffering across America.

Then the Republican majority leader said, it isn't enough that we are going to spend time on constitutional amendments going nowhere; we are now going to consider a change in the estate tax which will give extraordinary tax breaks to the richest people in America. The estate tax affects 3 out of every 1,000 Americans who die. Only 3 out of 1,000 pay any Federal estate tax. They are very wealthy people. By and large they make a lot of money. America has been very good to them. They have enjoyed a comfortable life because of their own talents and perhaps the good fortune of being born into a wealthy family.

Senator FRIST has suggested that rather than focus on the tens of thousands of Americans who would be benefited by stem cell medical research, we need to focus on a handful of Americans who are well off and give them a bigger tax break.

I am afraid that is why most Americans are losing hope in this Congress. They look at this Republican-led Congress and wonder, What are they thinking? Why aren't we debating an energy policy for America when gasoline prices are going through the roof? Why aren't we talking about health insurance for the 46 million Americans without health insurance and for the millions who have health insurance that isn't worth much? Why aren't we spending time passing the stem cell medical research bill, which passed on a bipartisan basis in the U.S. House of Representatives?

There is no explanation. The only explanation is, it doesn't fit into the campaign game plan of the Republican leadership. Do you know why? Because when you ask the American people, do you want us to move forward on medical research involving stem cells, 70 percent of the American people say yes.

It is an overwhelmingly popular bipartisan issue which the Republican side is scared to death of. That is unfortunate. We need to call on this.

I guarantee that when we return after the Fourth of July recess, the month of July is going to be stem cell month in the Senate. We are going to, with regularity, come to the floor and not only speak to this issue but ask unanimous consent to move to this issue. And every single day, the Republican leadership will have a chance to say, yes, to give hope to millions of people across America who want to see this medical research go forward or, no, to stick to their narrow political agenda in the hopes that the American people won't notice. I think they will. I think a lot of people will notice this one.

I have had a chance to meet with people in Chicago and across Illinois suffering from these diseases. They are heart-breaking meetings. Sit down with the parents of a child suffering

from juvenile diabetes and let them tell you what their life is like as they wake up their little girl two times in the middle of the night to take a blood sample to see if perhaps her diabetes is out of control. Talk to the family of that young man suffering from Lou Gehrig's disease who looks like the picture of health but confined to a wheelchair and can no longer speak. His wife speaks for him while tears roll down his face. Talk to my friend suffering from Parkinson's disease, including my great friend and colleague, Congressman LANE EVANS from Rock Island, IL, a young man suffering from Parkinson's and decided that he must step aside from Congress because of this battle.

Speak to those people and tell them that we have higher priorities than this medical research. I don't think you can. I can't. That is why stem cell month is going to be the month of July. This Senate is going to have its chance. We are going to continue to bring this up until Senator FRIST keeps his promise to bring this measure before the Senate before he leaves at the end of this year.

We are running out of time. America is running out of time. We need this medical research, and we need it now. There are no good excuses left.

MEDICAID DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENT

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, it has been less than 4 months since passage of the Deficit Reduction Act. That bill cut Medicaid health benefits for our Nation's low-income children, seniors, pregnant women, and people with disabilities.

One provision of the bill requires Medicaid beneficiaries to present a passport or birth certificate as proof of citizenship before they are eligible for benefits or to renew their benefits.

All States had the legal authority to require beneficiaries to furnish these documents before we passed the Federal law. However, 47 States have made the decision not to require that identification of Medicaid recipients.

Many low-income Americans don't have these documents, and most States have decided that requiring them would create a hardship and a barrier to health care for some of the poorest people in America.

Instead, States allowed written self-declaration of citizenship and had what are called prudent person policies in place if State personnel were suspicious and wanted further proof.

The inspector general of the Department of Health and Human Services conducted a review of these self-declaration policies and found that most States that conducted post-eligibility quality control measures have not found any problems with self-declaration of citizenship. The system was working.

Nevertheless, Congress passed the documentation requirement which will